

### REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended for purposes of expediting prosecution. Support for the amendment is provided by the specification as filed, for example in embodiments shown in FIG. 5A, #522, #526; FIG. 5B, 524; and FIG. 6, 606-612 and described in paragraphs [0046]-[0047] and [0051]-[0052]. Independent claims 19 and 20 are similarly amended. Dependent claims 2-6, 11, and 15-17 are amended merely for consistency with the amended base claim. Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

In the discussion set forth below, Applicants do not acquiesce to any rejection or averment in the Office Action unless expressly indicated.

#### Non-obviousness over the Lulla-Geer combination

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 15, 17 and 19-20 are understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over “Lulla” (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,820 to Lulla et al.) in view of “Geer” (U.S. Patent No. 5,079,725 to Geer). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of Lulla with teachings of Geer.

In view of the amendment to the independent claims 1, 19, and 20, however, the rejection is moot and should be withdrawn. The amendment to claim 1 recites use of the generated system identifier value in configuring, or halting configuring of, a target system based on whether or not the generated and stored system identifier value matches that of the target system. These limitations in combination with the other limitations do not appear to be suggested by the prior art.

Applicants further traverse the Examiner’s assertion that Lulla’s “portions 102-108 are equivalent to a plurality of devices of the system since each portion can have separate bits.” Those skilled in the art will recognize that the cited portions 102-108 are expressly described by Lulla as being a register 100 (FIG. 3; col. 2, line 64-65). Lulla also expressly indicates that the register is part of a single device 90 (FIG. 3; col.

2, line 64). The portions 102-108 of the register store data that indicate a version number for the IC, a manufacturing number, the presence of the register in the particular IC, and a part number of the IC (col. 3, lines 1-12). Thus, Lulla's express teachings are at odds with the Examiner's assertion of the register portions being equivalent to the claimed plurality of devices.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 15, 17 and 19-20 should be withdrawn.

Non-obviousness over the Lulla-Geer-Dreyer combination

Claim 3 is understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Geer combination in further view of "Dreyer" (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,066 to Dreyer et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Geer combination with teachings of Dreyer. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendment to claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

Non-obviousness over the Lulla-Geer-Jacobson combination

Claims 6-7 and 16 are understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Geer combination in further view of "Jacobson" (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,867 to Jacobson et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Geer combination with teachings of Jacobson. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendment to claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

Non-obviousness over the Lulla-Geer-Thiel combination

Claim 18 is understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Geer combination in further view of "Thiel" (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,509 to Thiel et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper

motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Geer combination with teachings of Thiel. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendment to claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

Non-obviousness over the Lulla-Geer-Jacobson-IBM combination

Claims 11-14 are understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Geer-Jacobson combination in further view of “IBM™ Technical Disclosure Bulletin” (IBM), NA8909262. The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Geer-Jacobson combination with teachings of IBM. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendment to claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested in view of the Remarks presented above. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Justin Liu 51,959/  
Justin Liu  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 51,959

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via EFS-Web with the United States Patent & Trademark Office on August 12, 2008.*

/Katherine Stofer/  
*Typed Name: Katherine Stofer*